

REMARKS

This responds to the Office Action mailed on June 19, 2007 and the Advisory Action mailed on September 13, 2007.

Claims 1, 5, 8, and 15 are amended, claims 21-27 were previously canceled without prejudice to the Applicant, claim 9 is hereby cancelled without prejudice to the Applicant; as a result, claims 1-8 and 10-20 are now pending in this application.

Support for the above amendments may be found in a variety of locations throughout the original filed specification. By way of example only, the Examiner's attention is directed to page 7 lines 3-5, page 8 lines 26-28, page 9 lines 8-11 and 23-25 page 10 lines 23-27, and page 14 lines 11-13 of the original filed specification. Moreover, these amendments are made to place the present application in condition for allowance. Therefore, Applicant believes that entry of the amendments is appropriate and will not necessitate a new search.

§103 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1, 3, 5-9, 11, 14-16, and 19-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Deen et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0167317A1), in view of Burrows et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2005/0055434A1). It is of course fundamental that in order to sustain an obviousness rejection that each and every limitation in the rejected claims must be taught or suggested in the proposed combination of references.

In Burrows, two servers cooperate to fulfill a request of a client, with one server performing some operations and the other being consulted as need to perform other operations. This interaction is unknown to the client. As but one example, see paragraph 39 and 40 of Burrows.

There is no mechanism in Burrows that supports the limitation that content does not have to be re-supplied by a user after successful authentication. The Examiner indicated that the previous language, in view of the Examiner, did not support this limitation being argued by the Applicant. As such, the Examiner did not consider it in the Final rejection.

The limitations added by way of amendment should now make this point clear and the language used mimics what was present in the original filed specification. Thus, the rejections of record should be withdrawn. Applicant respectfully requests an indication of the same.

Claims 2, 10 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Deen et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0167317A1), in view of Burrows et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2005/0055434A1), and in view of Bodin et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,604,106). These claims are dependent from amended independent claims; therefore for the amendments and remarks presented above with respect to the appropriate independent claims, the rejections of claims 2, 10, and 17 should be withdrawn.

Claims 4 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Deen et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0167317A1), in view of Burrows et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2005/0055434A1), and in view of Agarwalla et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,985,936). These claims are dependent from amended independent claims; therefore for the amendments and remarks presented above with respect to the appropriate independent claims, the rejections of claims 4, and 13 should be withdrawn.

Claim 12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Deen et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0167317A1), in view of Burrows et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2005/0055434A1), and in view of Rajan et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,871,220). Claim 12 is dependent from amended independent claim 8; therefore, for the amendments and remarks presented above with respect to independent claim 8, the rejection of claim 12 should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney at (513) 942-0224 to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Reservation of Rights

In the interest of clarity and brevity, Applicant may not have addressed every assertion made in the Office Action. Applicant's silence regarding any such assertion does not constitute any admission or acquiescence. Applicant reserves all rights not exercised in connection with this response, such as the right to challenge or rebut any tacit or explicit characterization of any reference or of any of the present claims, the right to challenge or rebut any asserted factual or legal basis of any of the rejections, the right to swear behind any cited reference such as provided under 37 C.F.R. § 1.131 or otherwise, or the right to assert co-ownership of any cited reference. Applicant does not admit that any of the cited references or any other references of record are relevant to the present claims, or that they constitute prior art. To the extent that any rejection or assertion is based upon the Examiner's personal knowledge, rather than any objective evidence of record as manifested by a cited prior art reference, Applicant timely objects to such reliance on Official Notice, and reserves all rights to request that the Examiner provide a reference or affidavit in support of such assertion, as required by MPEP § 2144.03. Applicant reserves all rights to pursue any cancelled claims in a subsequent patent application claiming the benefit of priority of the present patent application, and to request rejoinder of any withdrawn claim, as required by MPEP § 821.04.

AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE UNDER 37 CFR § 1.116 – EXPEDITED PROCEDURE

Serial Number: 10/698,303

Filing Date: October 31, 2003

Title: TECHNIQUES FOR PRESERVING CONTENT DURING A REDIRECTION FOR AUTHENTICATION

Page 9

Dkt: 1565.062US1

Respectfully submitted,

HASHEM MOHAMMAD EBRAHIMI ET AL.

By their Representatives,

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.


P.O. Box 2938

Minneapolis, MN 55402


(513) 942-0224


Date 9/18/07

By /


Joseph P. Mehrle
Reg. No. 45,535

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop RCE, Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on this 18 day of September 2007.


Name


Signature